

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 14 is amended for better clarity, at Applicants' preference. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Mehrpour at the interview held April 4, 2007, are appreciated. Applicants' record of the interview is incorporated in the following remarks.

A. Applicants note with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 8 and 20. These claims are not rewritten in independent form at the present time, because the base claims from which they depend are believed to be allowable as discussed below.

B. The Office Action rejects claims 1-7, 9 and 11-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,493,757 to Sakai et al. ("Sakai"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action recognizes that Sakai does not disclose a mobile terminal, but relies on "Official Notice" that using a mobile terminal is well known, and asserts that it would have been obvious to use a mobile device in the context of Sakai to "provide a wireless system that enable [sic] the user to be mobile, and move around while using the system." This analysis is flawed, for at least the following three reasons.

First, Sakai discloses using positions of output devices (which are alleged to correspond to the "output terminal" recited in the claims), but does not disclose generating a position of a terminal, mobile or otherwise. Even if the Office Action's proposed modification were made, the result would be that the position of the output devices is used, not that the position of a mobile terminal is generated, as is recited in each independent claim.

Second, Sakai does not disclose a "base station." It is clear that Sakai does not rely on a communication state between a base station and a terminal, mobile or otherwise, for generating terminal position information, such as is recited in each independent claim.

Third, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office Action's proposed motivation to combine the references. The Office Action assumes that it is inherently desirable for users to "move around while using the system." However, the Sakai disclosure appears to be directed to a business office environment, and in such an environment it seems more likely that it is desirable for users to stay at their work stations, rather than moving around while "using the system." One can easily envision the problems with office workers wandering around the halls while attempting to accomplish their computer work, rather than sitting in their assigned work space to do so.

C. The dependent claims are allowable at least for their dependence on allowable base claims, as well as for additional features they recite. For example, claim 4 recites "the output control terminal transmitting a data output request to the output terminal when the mobile terminal position is within a predetermined range based on the output terminal position and when a predetermined period of time has passed since the mobile terminal position became within the predetermined range," and claim 16 recites a similar feature. The Office Action relies on certain passages of Sakai as disclosing this feature, but the cited passages clearly have nothing to do with an action being performed "when a predetermined period of time has passed since the mobile terminal position became within the predetermined range."

D. During the interview, as additional motivation, the Examiner asserted that "GPS is very known today." However, this assertion is irrelevant to the rejection, and no explanation was given as to how the general existence of GPS would have made it obvious to modify Sakai in a way that resulted in the claimed combinations of features. It is further

noted that the relevant inquiry is what would have been obvious at the time of the invention, (over five years ago in this case), not the present time.

Should any rejection be maintained that relies on "Official Notice," Applicants request that a reference be provided to support the Office Action's position that the allegedly well-known feature would have been obvious in the relevant context.

\* \* \*

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

J. Adam Neff  
Registration No. 41,218

JAO:JAN/hs

Date: April 24, 2007

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--